

**REMARKS**

**Foreign Priority:**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority document has been received at the Patent Office.

**Information Disclosure Statement:**

The Examiner has initialed and returned the form PTO-1449 filed on October 28, 2003. However, rather than initialing the cited reference, the Examiner has initialed a line in which no reference is identified.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner re-initial the Form PTO/SB/08 A & B so as to make it clear that the cited reference was considered.

**Claim Rejections:**

Claims 1 to 3 are the only claims that have been examined in the present application, and currently all of the claims stand rejected.

***35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection - Claims 1 and 2:***

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 7-18068 to Lun, in view of EP 0 420 564 to Endo et al. In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 3. Namely, claim 1 requires that "one of the center pin and the flat plate portion is molded mainly of polyacetal-system synthetic resin, the other is molded mainly of

polybutylene-system or polyethylene-system synthetic resin, and titanium oxide is added to at least one of these two kinds of synthetic resin.” Claim 1.

Therefore, as the Examiner has admitted that neither of the Lun or Endo references teach or suggest this aspect of the claimed invention, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable over both Lun and Endo, taken individually or in combination.

With that said, Applicant will now address the Examiner’s independent rejection of claim 3, as set forth in the July 14, 2005 Office Action.

***35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection - Claim 3:***

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lun in view of Endo, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,286 to Kawatsu et al. In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

In the present invention, the use of titanium oxide enhances the wear prevention of the component in which it is used. *See* Specification, page 5, lines 20-21. Contrary to the assertions by the Examiner, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Kawatsu (specifically the use of titanium oxide) with the teachings of the Lun or Endo references, to achieve the claimed invention.

In Kawatsu, a number of materials are identified to aid in the sliding friction aspects of a polyester film. Specifically, Kawatsu discloses that clay, mica, titanium oxide, calcium carbonate, kaolin, talc or wet or dry silica, or organic particles of acrylic acid or styrene can be used to reduce sliding friction. Col. 5, lines 20-28. However, there is no teaching in either

Kawatsu or Endo regarding the wear of components or the generation of resin powder when a component is rotated at high speeds.

As indicated above, in the present invention, titanium oxide is used to improve wear resistance of the components. Thus, a tape cassette is provided which can prevent undesirable wear of a reel, even when the reel is rotated at high speeds. Additionally, because of the wear resistance of the present invention, the claimed configuration aids in preventing the generation of sliding resin powder and vibrations of the reel, which are caused by the wear of the reel. *See* Specification, page 4, lines 2 to 6.

Because neither of the Endo or the Kawatsu references teach this aspect of the claimed invention, Applicant submits that a skilled artisan would not have found it obvious to combine the references as alleged to achieve the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the above references as suggested by the Examiner, and even if one combined the references as suggested the resultant combination would fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the claimed invention, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant hereby requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of the claims.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Application Number: 10/693,894

Our Ref: Q78042  
Art Unit: 2652

**Conclusion:**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Terrance J. Wikberg  
Registration No. 47,177

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 14, 2005